

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-33 and 46-51 are presented for examination. No new matter has been added.

Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 46-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al) and WO 01/01663 A1 (Gabrielsson et al).

As correctly stated in the Office action, Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest that the removing of a particular attachment is “responsive to identifying the particular attachment as **exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device.**” The Office action combined Rabe-Hesketh with Gabrielsson to show this feature.

Gabrielsson is directed at a method of organizing incoming electronic messages for a user who can access her messages via at least two different types of access environments. Specifically, in Gabrielsson, the decision to “thin” an electronic message is based on predefined user preferences (Gabrielsson, Fig. 3; p. 13, ll. 20-27), such that a separate message version is created for each type of access environment (Gabrielsson, p. 9, ll. 14-17). Thus, in Gabrielsson, if the user preferences are specified as described with reference to Figure 5 and the user accesses the messages via an Ethernet connection using a Netscape client, a message would be presented to the user in its original format (Gabrielsson, p. 13, ll. 28-32), even if the message includes an extraordinary multimedia attachment that exceeds the capabilities of the user’s access environment.

In contrast, claim 1 recites “removing of a particular attachment” “responsive to identifying the particular attachment as **exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device.**” In other words, the predetermined criteria that triggers “thinning” in Gabrielsson is different from a condition that invokes an operation of “removing of a particular attachment” in claim 1.

Thus, Gabrielsson, whether considered separately or in combination with Rabe-Hesketh, fails to disclose or suggest either “removing of a particular attachment” or that that the removing of a particular attachment is “responsive to identifying the particular attachment as **exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device,**” as recited in claim 1 and 51.

Because the combination of Gabrielsson and Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, claim 1, its dependent claims, and claim 51 are patentable and should be allowed.

Claim 26, recites “**responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of an intended recipient’s receiving device,** detaching said objects from said message.” Thus, claim 26 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Claim 46, as amended, recites “an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at least one reference **responsive to identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device.**” Thus, claim 46 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

1. **Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 12-12-05



\_\_\_\_\_  
Elena B. Dreszer  
Reg. No. 55,128

Customer No. 08791  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 720-8300